Generic 'du' in time and context – tracking an ongoing (re)conventionalization

Jensen, Torben Juel

Publication date:
2012

Document version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (APA):
Jensen, T. J. (2012). *Generic 'du' in time and context – tracking an ongoing (re)conventionalization*. Abstract from Symposium on the Dynamics of Language Conventionalization, København, Denmark. http://langtic.inss.ku.dk/english/activities/Symposium_january_2012/Book_of_Abstracts_20_Dec_2011.pdf/

Symposium on the Dynamics of Language Conventionalization

Organized by the research group Language in Time and Context

University of Copenhagen, 25-26 January 2012

Abstracts

20th December 2011

How do language conventions emerge from the use of indeterminate linguistic signs?

Nigel Love (Nigel.Love@uct.ac.za)

Biologically, human language is undoubtedly a product and reflex of innate aptitudes for intraspecific co-ordination and co-action. But it is also an artefactual construct in many respects under our conscious control, and its viability as a means of communication depends on culturally acquired patterns of language use, such that its capacity to link individuals is a matter of how far those individuals have a particular pattern in common. Language in and of itself by no means automatically enables social co-ordination: as a non-Danish-speaking Englishman whatever co-action I can achieve with a monolingual Dane will not, at least in its earliest stages, owe much to the fact that we both have language. So the creation and maintenance of linguistic conventions, in the broadest sense, would appear to be of the highest importance.

At the same time, linguistic signs are radically indeterminate. It is only because that is so that language can meet the open-ended, unpredictable communicational demands imposed upon it. Communication by means of language is not achieved by our being in prior possession of some system of correspondences between linguistic forms and their meanings, such that I express a meaning by encoding it in a particular form, and you understand me by decoding the form I used so as to arrive at my meaning. There is no way we could ever have come into possession of such a system. Linguistic communication is a matter of deploying one's unique linguistic resources in such a way as in the context will make satisfactory sense in and of the interaction in question; and making satisfactory sense requires, along with much else, perceiving and acting on relevant similarities between the instant utterance or inscription and others one has experienced. This process does not and could not require of the participants that they determinately recognise or identify the allegedly invariant linguistic signs instantiated in the instant exchange in virtue of which that exchange was communicatively successful.

So what are language conventions and where do they come from? It will be argued that they are a product both of the first-order communicational process itself and of the attempt to make sense of it by engaging in essentially metalinguistic processes of decontextualisation, abstraction and reification. Using language involves making analogical use of prior instances of language, a process that confers an inherently unstable conventionality on the linguistic signs thus incessantly recycled and transmuted. And that is why language conventions dwell in the shadow world of the virtual, the indeterminate and the perpetually revisable, while fostering the important illusion that language can throw a bridge between somatically discrete, isolated individuals.

Stability and variation in the lexical norm

Hanne Ruus (haru@hum.ku.dk)

When I devised a method for finding the central parts of the lexical norm in a language and applied it on carefully selected material from Modern Danish, I found 1117 lemmas and showed that a large part of them was connected in network structures by semantic relations based on lexical semantics combined with cognitive semantics (Cruse 1986, Lakoff 1987, Johnson 1987). This work is documented in my book on Danish core words, Central parts of the lexical norm (Ruus, 1995). When this result is compared to the lemma inventories of Older Danish texts, the core words from Modern Danish reoccur to a very large extent. However, a formal reidentification does not guarantee comparable semantic relations.

In the paper I shall discuss semantic convergences and divergences between the Modern and the Older Danish lemmas and support my understanding of the semantic relations of the Older Danish lemmas by consulting the onomasiological lexicographic sources from the 16th century, contemporaries of the investigated Older Danish texts. I shall try to discover to what extent the arrangement of the words found in the onomasiological lexical resources can be interpreted as evidence of semantic relations similar to or diverging from the relations in Modern Danish. In the case of divergence I shall follow the change through the intervening centuries in the hope of discovering traces of the different conventionalizing processes described in Duncker (2012, forthcoming).

References:

Cruse, D. A. 1986, *Lexical Semantics*, Cambridge University Press

Duncker, Dorthe, 2012 (forthcoming): Norm, situering og sproglige kendsgerninger, in *Danske Talesprog*.

Johnson, Mark, 1987, *The Body in the Mind, The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*, The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George, 1987, *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things, What Categories Reveal about the Mind*, The University of Chicago Press.

Ruus, Hanne, 1995, *Danske Kerneord, Centrale dele af den leksikalske norm, I-II*, [*Danish core words, Central parts of the lexical norm*] Museum Tusculanum.

Ruus, Hanne 2002, 'A Corpus-based Electronic Dictionary for (Re)search', in Anna Braasch and Claus Povlsen (Eds.): *Proceedings of theTenth EURALEX International Congress, EURALEX 2002*, Copenhagen, Denmark, August 13-17, 2002, Volume I, p.175-185.

Ruus, Hanne & Duncker, Dorthe 2011, ' Corpus-based variation studies – A methodology ', in F Gregersen, JK

Parrot & P Quist (Eds.) , *Language Variation – European perspectives III: Selected papers from the 5th International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVE 5)*, Copenhagen, June 2009 , John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 161-172.

Vocabulorum variorum expositio (Kbh. 1576), Udg. af Jørgen Larsen for UJDS, C.A. Reitzels Forlag, Kbh. 1995.

Conventionalization and formulaicity

Dorthe Duncker (duncker@hum.ku.dk)

From a conventionalization perspective formulaic sequences are important, firstly for being conventions themselves, and secondly because they help the communicating participants to determine the type of situation (or genre) in which they are presently involved and thereby to mark out the communicational space available for the participants. All sorts of concomitant patterns of communication are candidates for formulaicity, but only some are turned into (transient or long lasting) formulaic sequences; and this happens through the spatio-temporal processes of conventionalization. In the last decades formulaicity has attracted a rising (renewed) interest in usage-based language studies (e.g., Corrigan et al. 2009; Schmitt 2004; Wray 2002).

Formulaic sequences are epiphenomenal, they operate on a temporal trace created interactionally and require participants to recognize and recollect prior communicative experience, as well as to repeat, recreate and recontextualize prior actions. While recognition is quite spontaneous, recollection and repetition are often more demanding. Recollection is goal oriented, it implies that the person who actively tries to remember, believes that there actually is something to recall, something particular.

Participants seem to prefer formulaic over non-formulaic sequences when they believe they know a formulaic way of saying what they want to say, and they make an effort to produce formulaic sequences, even when their memory fails them. There is a tendency for speakers to pause between formulaic sequences, rather than in the middle of them, and this has been seen as indicative of formulaic sequences being holistically stored units in the brains of the speakers (e.g., Wray 2004). However, intra-formulaic pausing could also be seen as the speakers' attempt to meet formulaic expectations of their fellow interlocutors, and in that case recollection is not merely a private process but a communicative issue involving other participants. This paper will focus on such episodes of formulaic recollection and evaluate them in the light of conventionalization. Examples will be given, mostly from the Danish BySoc Corpus (Gregersen and Pedersen 1991), a collection of 76 conversations of a duration of 1-2 hours, among 2-5 participants.

References:

Corrigan, Roberta, et al. (eds.) (2009), *Formulaic Language. Distribution and historical change.* 1-2; Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins B. V.

Gregersen, Frans and Pedersen, Inge Lise (eds.) (1991), *The Copenhagen Study in Urban Sociolinguistics.* Institut for dansk Dialektforsknings publikationer, serie A, nr. 30, Copenhagen: C. A. Reitzels forlag.

Schmitt, Norbert (ed.), (2004), *Formulaic sequences: acquisition, processing, and use.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins B. V.

Wray, Alison (2002), *Formulaic Language and the Lexicon.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wray, Alison (2004), ''Here's one I prepared earlier' Formulaic language learning on television', in Norbert Schmitt (ed.), (2004), 249-68.

Reduction of plosives by individual speakers in interaction

Nicolai Pharao (nicolaip@hum.ku.dk)

Segmental variation is a common phenomenon in connected speech, often leading to reduced variants of the segments that are attested in read speech. One type of reduction is the so-called target undershoot in the articulation of plosives, where words that are realized with a plosive in distinct speech (e.g. 'oppe, sætter, lægger' *up, sets, lays* realized [ʌbə sɛdɐ lɛgɐ]) will instead contain a fricative or approximant in connected speech, (i.e. 'oppe, sætter, lægger' realized [ʌβə sɛɾɐ lɛɣɐ]).

A quantitative analysis of the phonetic factors involved in the reduction of plosives in Danish connected speech using map task dialogues (Pharao 2011) has shown that the effects of the factors segmental environment, stress, articulation rate and place of articulation are similar to those found for other European languages (De Jong:1998, Gonzales:2002). Importantly, it was found that dorsals are most likely to be reduced and labials are least likely to be reduced, i.e 'lægger' is more likely to be realized as [lɛɣɐ] than 'oppe' is to be realized as [ʌβə].

The present study seeks to investigate how the patterns found at the group level correlate with the patterns found for individual speakers, and how the processes of plosive reduction develop over the course of particular interactions. This is done by examining the behaviour of individual speakers in each of the four map task dialogues in which they participated. A comparison of individual speakers' tendencies to reduce plosives relative to the average tendency of the group as a whole shows that speakers who have an increased tendency to reduce /b/ also show an increased tendency to reduce /g/, i.e. if a speaker often says [ʌβə] for 'oppe' he or she is also likely often to say [lɛɣɐ] for 'lægger'. This suggests that reduction of /b/ and /g/, rather than being two separate processes applying to each segment, can be interpreted as the outcome of a more general process of spirantization of plosives in intervocalic position.

To further understand this variation, the tendency for spirantization for each speaker in a set of dialogues is compared to see how the tendency develops in the course of particular conversations. This analysis will provide a way of seeing how spirantization may be the subject of "situated conventionalization" by answering the following questions: When do speakers begin to spirantize in a conversation? Do interlocutors accommodate to each other with respect to spirantization? Do speakers continue to spirantize throughout a conversation once they have begun to do so or do they revert to 'canonical' pronunciations?

References:

De Jong, K. 1998. Stress-related variation in the articulation of coda alveolar stops: flapping revisited. *Journal of Phonetics* 16, 283-310.

Gonzales, C. 2002. Phonetic variation in voiced obstruents in North-Central Peninsular Spanish. *Journal of the International Phonetics Association* 32(1), 17-31.

Pharao, N. (2011) Plosive Reduction at the Group Level and in the Individual Speaker, *Proceedings of The International Congress of Phonetic Sciences XVII*, City University of Hong Kong

Generic 'du' in time and context – tracking an ongoing (re)conventionalization

Torben Juel Jensen (tjuelj@hum.ku.dk)

In modern Danish, a handful of pronouns can be used to refer to a generic referent, i.e. to a group of persons not further defined, in some cases mankind in general. In Standard Danish, the most frequently used pronoun with generic reference is *man*, developed from the noun *man(d)* (≈ English *man*). In recent decades, though, the second person singular pronoun *du* has gained ground, in parallel to similar recent developments in other languages (e.g. Laberge & Sankoff 1980; Kitagawa & Lehrer 1990).

A large scale study based on recordings of conversations with speakers from four different geographical locations (including the capital Copenhagen) and three different points in time, 1970, the 1980ies and 2005-10, documents a rise in the use of generic *du*. The study indicates that the increased use has spread from the Copenhagen area and outwards to the rest of the Danish speech community, and that the use is correlated with the gender and social class of the speaker. It also indicates that the use of *du* has peaked and is now decreasing or stabilizing at a lower level (Jensen 2009). The study is part of the LANCHART project on language change in 20th century Danish (www.lanchart.hum.ku.dk).

This paper focuses on the *individual* speaker and situation in light of this macro level development: A number of speakers in the survey have been recorded twice within a twenty year interval, and in different situations – in interaction with different interviewers and/or in group conversation as well as in sociolinguistic interviews. This makes it possible to study intra-individual variation (including life span change) with respect to the use of generic pronouns. The results show that a surprisingly large proportion of the speakers do change over their lifespan, some in the direction of their community (as established by the trend study), but some in the opposite direction. They also show that the individual speakers vary considerably with respect to the use of *du* (in comparison with other pronouns with generic reference) from conversation to conversation as well as during the same conversation. I seek to correlate this variation with time (the life history of the speaker and time line of the conversation as it unfolds) and context (the type of interaction and the interlocutor(s)).

References:

Jensen, T.J. (2009). Generic variation? Developments in the use of generic pronouns in late 20th century spoken Danish, *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 41, 83-115.

Kitagawa, C. & A. Lehrer (1990). Impersonal uses of personal pronouns, *Journal of Pragmatics* 14, 739-759.

Laberge, S. & G. Sankoff (1980). Anything you can do, i Sankoff, Gillian (red.) *The social life of language*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 271-293.

Register- and genre-based conventionalisation in the German case system

Alan Scott (Alan.Scott@nottingham.ac.uk)

As a result of deflection the present-day German case system is reduced in comparison to its original state. One manifestation of this is the competition involving morphological case constructions (see e.g. Behaghel 1924, Di Meola 2004). This paper investigates, under a usage-based approach (e.g. Bybee 2006), how the use of various competing constructions has become conventionalised according to genre and register (following e.g. Xiao & McEnery 2005).

Taking data from corpora of formal writing, informal writing, and informal speech, I focus on competition involving the genitive case and roles originally performed by the genitive but now performed by a competitor; this is exemplified in (1)-(5).

(1) genitive	*das Buch meines Vaters* 'the book my.GEN father.GEN'
(2) *von*-construction	*das Buch von meinem Vater* 'the book of my father'
(3) periphrastic possessive	*meinem Vater sein Buch* 'my.DAT father his book'
(4) possessive *-s*	*Vaters Buch* 'father.POSS book'
(5) extended possessive *-s*	*?mein Vaters Buch* 'my father.POSS book'

By drawing data from a variety of registers and genres, this investigation highlights the extent to which pragmatic factors influence the division of labour between the genitive and its competitors.

The situation in the data shows clear register- and genre-based conventionalisations regarding which construction is used, and in which situation. Although the genitive is shown to dominate its competitors in all registers of standard German (at least in the corpora studied), clear trends are visible in the use of the competing constructions in the different corpora. As is widely known, the genitive is indeed most strongly conventionalised in formal written genres (e.g. Barbour & Stevenson 1990); the *von*-construction is stronger in informal speech than in formal writing. Possessive *-s* is strongly associated with formal writing. Extended possessive *-s* – an apparent novelty – is conventional only in informal online communication.

I conclude that the conventionalisation by register and genre of the use of these synonymous constructions is the result of two factors. One is usage, which has led to the non-case constructions appearing in registers and genres characterised by their weaker use of case morphology. The other is the codification of German and the recommendations of prescriptive grammars: genitive case marking has been preserved as a prestige variant in formal language, and this has spread to some extent to less formal varieties.

References:

Barbour, Stephen & Patrick Stevenson. 1990. *Variation in German: A Critical Approach to German Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Behaghel, Otto. 1924. *Deutsche Syntax: Eine geschichtliche Darstellung. Band II: Die Wortklassen und Wortformen. B. Adverbium. C. Verbum*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Bybee, Joan. 2006. From usage to grammar: the mind's response to repetition. *Language* 82(4): 711-733.

Di Meola, Claudio. 2004. The rise of the prepositional genitive in German – a grammaticalization phenomenon. *Lingua* 114, 165-182.

Xiao, Zhonghua & Anthony McEnery. 2005. Two approaches to genre analysis: three genres in Modern American English. *Journal of English Linguistics* 33(1): 62-82.

Language Dynamics, Values, Interactivity, and the Articulation of Social-cognitive-affective assemblages

Paul J. Thibault (pauljthibault@yahoo.com)

Humans live in and have constructed a unique extended ecology that is defined by our inter-connectedness – with other persons, with artefacts, with social institutions, with technologies. Moreover, humans learn best in situations that promote rich, culturally saturated interactivity when they engage with and manipulate external artefacts to solve learning tasks and cognitive problems in often complex social, technological and cognitive environments. Humans integrate their activities to shared cultural patterns and in doing so they coordinate their activities across times and places (Harris 1990). Both the biological and cognitive sciences have demonstrated an increased sensitivity to the fact that learning and thinking are not purely private and internal processes of individuals. They reflect inter-individual dynamics that are shaped by culture (Cowley 2007; Steffensen 2009; Thibault 2008, 2011).

This realisation has also cast doubt on the traditional academic distinction between 'cognition', seen as taking place within persons, and 'communication', seen as occurring between persons. Perceiving, acting, thinking, learning, decision making, moving, doing things with artefacts, and language are all shaped by the norms and values of what Goffman (1983) called the *interaction order*. What is often somewhat loosely called 'communication' is in fact a socially organized way of co-ordinating thinking, feeling, and action between persons. On the traditional view, 'cognition' and 'communication' were seen as separate areas of study within very different research traditions. This view is now seen as less tenable. Cognition occurs between persons and between persons and their artefacts in culturally rich environments. Humans are borne into and learn to exploit Distributed Cognitive Systems (DCSs). It is our participation in DCSs after birth that enables us to become persons. Humans are 'ecologically special' (Ross 2007) precisely because of this fact. The human ecology depends on DCSs to a far greater extent than other species.

A DCS consists of a network of persons who coordinate and interact with each and with relevant artefacts and technologies in order to perform cognitive and learning tasks that could not be achieved by any of the components of the DCS on their own. A DCS thus has cognitive and affective properties and capacities that are irreducible to the properties of its component parts. Cognition and affect are distributed between brains, bodies, and aspects of the physical, technological, and cultural worlds of persons (Clark 1997). Hutchins (1995). Languaging behaviour is the "glue and grout of social co-ordination" (Steffensen, Thibault, and Cowley 2010: 208) in DCSs because it articulates heterogeneous elements (e.g. persons, artefacts, tools, technologies, etc.) as social-cognitive-affective assemblages without in any way sacrificing the heterogeneity and autonomy of the component parts (Deleuze 2004). The component parts retain their capacity to be detached from any given assemblage and attached to others. When such a system arises, the capacities of the different components interact with each so that the new whole has emergent properties. By the same token, the new whole – the assemblage -- constrains and enables its components, damping or inhibiting some capacities, amplifying or extending others, and giving rise to new ones. In exploring these issues, I will pay attention to the micro-temporal dimensions of the bodily dynamics that shape interaction between persons and how these are shaped and guided by normative values and conventional constraints that emanate from cultural-historical timescales.

References:

Clark, Andy 1997. *Being There: Putting brain, body and world together again*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Cowley, S.J. (2007). Cognitive dynamics and distributed language. *Language Sciences,* 29/5: 575-583.

Deleuze, Gilles 2004 [1968]. *Difference and Repetition*. Trans. Paul Patton. London and New York: Continuum.

Goffman, E. (1983). The interaction order. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 1-17.

Harris, Roy (1990). 'On redefining linguistics.' In: Hayley G. Davis and Talbot J. Taylor (Eds.), *Redefining Linguistics*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 18-52.

Hutchins, Edwin 1995. How a cockpit manages its speed. *Cognitive Science* 19: 265-288.

Ross, Don (2007). '*H. sapiens* as ecologically special: what does language contribute?.' *Language Sciences* 29: 710-731.

Steffensen, S.V. (2009). Language, Languaging, and the Extended Mind Hypothesis. *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 17(3), 677-698.

Steffensen, Sune V., Thibault, Paul J. and Cowley, Stephen J. (2010). 'Living in the social meshwork: the case of health interaction.' In: Stephen Cowley, João C. Major, Sune V. Steffensen and Alfredo Dinis (Eds.), *Signifying Bodies: Biosemiosis, interaction and health*. Braga: The Faculty of Philosophy of Braga Portuguese Catholic University, pp. 207-244.

Thibault, Paul J. (2008). 'Face-to-face communication and body language.' In: Karlfried Knapp and Gerd Antos (Eds.), *Handbooks of Applied Linguistics (HAL) Linguistics for Problem-Solving: Perspectives on Communication Competence, Language and Communication Problems, and Practical Solutions*. Volume 2: *Interpersonal Communication*. Gerd Antos & Eija Ventola (eds.). Berlin. Mouton, pp. 285-330.

Thibault, Paul J. (2011). 'First-order languaging dynamics and second-order language: the distributed language view.' *Ecological Psychology* 23(3): 210-245. To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10407413.2011.591274

When is the 'new' word not recognized as such?

Line Brink Worsøe (linebw@hum.ku.dk)

To create new words and make them signs of communication is an interesting case in the complex integrational process we all take part in, when getting situations to make sense for ourselves and others. I here rely on the field of integrationism (Harris: 1996, Harris & Hutton: 2007) in describing how new words are recognized as such, and how they are integrated enough to gain situational status as 'known'.

The purpose of this presentation is first and foremost to discuss how to explore and describe how apparently new words become 'known' between people in social interaction. Secondly, I want to discuss, how to integrate the notion of knowing in studying human communication. I thus want to address following question: How do we become experts? That is, in the case of 'the new word', when is something 'known'? And epistemologically: How can we possibly grasp the role of our knowledge in the study of e.g. neologism?

Since integrationism is a theoretical framework, rather than an empirical approach, I discuss the question of 'knowingness' from different methodological angles, while trying to relate the discussion to some empirical samples of real life conversation in order to contextualize the subject. I base my thesis on integrationism, and therefore this presentation will acknowledge the discussion of 'knowledge' by integrationist Roy Harris (ibid). But to look at what it takes to 'know' something, I will furthermore draw upon the theory of 'distributed cognitive system' (Thibault: 2011) as well as the concepts of 'certainty' (Wittgenstein: 1969), 'fulfillment' (Rogers: 1980), 'microgenesis' (Valsiner: 2009, Kimchi et al.: 2005), and 'aquaintance' (James: 1890) respectively. Moreover, I will, in this presentation, draw upon selected data samples from freely-spoken conversation and interaction between informants. The samples will cover examples of new words, unknown words or senses of words not preliminarily known to the participants, and hopefully shed light upon how these are integrated and dealt with in communication.

References:

Harris, R. (1996): *Sign, Language and Communication*, Routledge Publishers

Harris, R. & C. Hutton (2007): *Definition in theory and practice: language, lexicography and the law*, Continuum Press

Hermann, J. & F. Gregersen (1978): *Gennem sproget*, Gyldendals Forlag

James, W. (1950[1890]): *The Principles of psychology*, Dover Publishers

Rogers, C. (1980): *A way of being*, London, Houghton

Thibault, P.T. (2011): "First-Order Languaging Dynamics and Second-Order Language: The distributed Language View", In: *Ecological Psychology*, pp.210-245, Routledge Publisher

Valsiner, J. (2009): “Integrating Psychology within the Globalizing World: A Requiem to the Post-Modernist Experiment with Wissenschaft”, In: *Integrative Psychological Behaviour*, Springer Science, pp. 1–21

Wittgenstein, L. (1975[1969]): *On certainty*, Blackwell Publishers

What is HIV?
- When the conventionalization of meaning becomes a part of improving sexual health

Bjarke Damm (bdamm@hum.ku.dk)

The sexual health among men who have sex with men (MSM) in high-income countries is not getting better (UNAIDS 2011). There is thus an urgent need for a greater understanding of the underlying causes of MSM's increasing risk behaviour, in order to turn around the disturbing epidemiological trend (Wolitski 2011).

According to a growing body of evidence MSM's risky sexual behaviour is to a large extend driven by psychosocial factors (Neville & Adams 2009) – however the bulk of this work, is reductionist, and thus fails to recognize the fact that individuals choices and behaviours are affected by e.g. society, culture and the context they occur in.

This paper takes a *relational* approach (Cowley et al. 2010) to health and health care by discussing how aspects like e.g. the physical, emotional, and social roles of sex and sexual relationships; the intrinsically human feelings and desires that drive human sexuality; and social marginalization, discrimination and stigma intertwine with sexual behavior.

A relational approach recognizes that life is fundamentally irreducible to bio-molecular and chemical processes, because although human beings are biological bodies, they also engage in significant relations with others in a complex social world.

Hence many dysfunctions can be reinterpreted as communicative and relational problems that reach across biological, mental and social levels. Communicative signs therefore become a central part of understanding healthy and unhealthy behaviours.

By conceptualizing signs as creative processes that are bound in time and context (Harris 1996), it is possible to investigate the myriads of distinctive meanings different groups (e.g. HIV-negative MSM, HIV-positive MSM and doctors) assign to the same signs (relating to sex and sexual behaviour) and the conventionalization processes by witch these signs are created, sustained and reproduced.

This will generate a more accurate understanding of MSM's sexual behaviour, witch in turn is essential to understanding and promoting sexual health.

References:

Cowley, S.J., Major, J.C., Steffensen, S.V. & Dinis, A. (2010): *Signifying Bodies – Biosemiosis, Interaction and Health*. University of Braga.

Harris, R. (1996): *Signs, Language and Communication*. Routledge, London.

Neville, S. & Adams, J. (2009): "Condom use in men who have sex with men: A literature review" in *Contemporary Nurse*, 33(2): 130-139.

Wolitski, R.J. & Fenton, K.A. (2011): "Sexual Health, HIV, and Sexually Transmitted Infections among Gay, Bisexual, and Other Men Who Have Sex with Men in the United States" in *AIDS Behavior*, (15): 9-17

http://www.unaids.org/globalreport/documents/20101123_GlobalReport_full_en.pdf

The emergence of procedural conventions in dialogue

Gregory Mills (gjmills@stanford.edu)

A key problem for models of dialogue is to explain how conventions are established and sustained. Existing accounts emphasize the importance of interaction, demonstrating how collaborative feedback leads to representations that are more concise (Krauss and Weinheimer 1967; Clark 1996), abstract (Schwartz 1995), systematized (Healey 1997; Mills and Healey 2006), stable and arbitrary (Garrod et al 2007).

Despite these studies' very different approaches, a common methodological choice is their study of how interlocutors co-ordinate on the content of referring expressions. However, co-ordination in dialogue also requires procedural co-ordination (Schegloff 2007).

To investigate procedural co-ordination we report a collaborative task which presents participants with the recurrent co-ordination problem of ordering their actions and utterances into a single coherent sequence: Pairs of participants communicate via a text-based chat-tool (Healey and Mills 2006). Each participant's computer also displays a task window containing a list of randomly generated words. Solving the task requires participants to combine their lists of words into a single alphabetically ordered list. To select a word, participants type the word preceded with "/". To ensure collaboration, participants can only select words displayed on the other participant's screen and vice versa. Note that this task is trivial for an individual participant. However, for pairs of participants, this task presents the coordination problem of interleaving their selections correctly: participants cannot select each other's words, words can't be selected twice, and the words need to be selected in the correct order. (See Mills 2011 for more detailed description).

Despite the task only permitting a single logical solution (and being referentially transparent – the words are the referents), participants develop group-specific routines for co-ordinating their turns into a coherent sequence. Importantly, we show how this development does not occur through explicit negotiation: in the initial trials, participants' attempts to explicitly negotiate these routines more often than not prove unsuccessful (cf. Pickering and Garrod 2004, who observed similar patterns in a series of maze game experiments).

Instead, we demonstrate how these routines emerge via tacit negotiation as a consequence of interlocutors' collaborative attempts to deal with miscommunication. Drawing on how interlocutors engage in resolving these misunderstandings in the test phase, we argue that these collaborative routines operate normatively, having become conventionalized by the interlocutors.

References:

Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Garrod, S., Fay, N., Lee, J., Oberlander, J., & MacLeod, T. (2007). Foundations of Representation: Where Might Graphical Symbol Systems Come From? *Cognitive Science: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 31(6), 961–987.

Healey, P.G.T. (1997). Expertise or expert-ese: The emergence of task-oriented sub-languages. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual Conference of The Cognitive Science Society*. Stanford University, CA.

Healey, P. G. T. & Mills, G. (2006). Participation, precedence and co-ordination. In *Proceedings of the 28th Conference of the Cognitive Science Society,* Canada

Krauss, R. M. and Weinheimer, S. (1966). Concurrent feedback, confirmation and the encoding of referents in verbal communication. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4 (3), 343–346.

Mills, G. J. (2011). The emergence of procedural conventions in dialogue In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*. Boston. USA

Pickering, M. J. and Garrod, S. (2004). Towards a mechanistic psychology of dialogue. *Behavioural and Brain Sciences,* 27(2), 169–190.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: Volume 1: A Primer in Conversation Analysis.* Cambridge University Press

Problems of the “integration” of linguistic and literary studies

Christian Benne (c.benne@litcul.sdu.dk)

The type of “integrational linguistics” advanced by the organisers of the symposium shares many basic premises and features with the continental tradition of philological-hermeneutical scholarship – to the point where it, in certain respects at least, appears to be a kind of revival of philology unconscious of its atavism. Unsurprisingly therefore, integrational linguists argue implicitly (sometimes even explicitly) for a new rapprochement of linguistic and literary studies. The divergence of these formerly united disciplines during the course of the last century has provoked the development of integrational linguistics in the first place. The talk presented here will point out the contingent as well as systematic historical connections between integrational linguistics and developments in literary studies and philosophy. It will then mainly concentrate on the major theoretical and practical obstacles for the renewal of interdisciplinary perspectives on conventionalization and communication (a concept that is problematic in itself). Finally, it will illustrate the aporetical challenges, but also the chances, which these perspectives contain, with the help of examples spanning across linguistic, literary and editorial theory.

The artefactual approach: The relation between the textual content and the physical appearance of the text in written multi text primary sources in the process of transmission (scholarly editing)

Anne Mette Hansen (amh@hum.ku.dk)

The artefactual approach presumes that texts do not exist independently of their material embodiments and that the physical form of the text is an integrated part of its meaning. Textual scholars therefore need to look at the whole textual artefact and the relationship between the textual content and physical features such as form, layout, rubrication, illumination/illustration, paratextual features such as marginalia and preliminaries, and the surrounding textual context (Driscoll 2010, Hansen 2006).

Traditionally, scholarly editing has had its primary interest in the text itself. The principal approach is textual criticism which aims at reconstructing an original or best text by means of the stemmatic method and presenting this edited text to the reader in a critical edition with an apparatus which provides emendations, variant readings and notes (Maas 1958). Thus, the presented text is not the text of the textual artefact/the primary source, but a new textual construction: the text of the edition. This has consequences not only for the reading and understanding of the text but also for the examination. As an example thereof literary scholars have based their analysis of layout and typography and its potential significance on the edited text assuming that the physical appearance of the primary source is consistent with the edited one.

The editorial communication process of scholarly editing has so far not been examined in details. Future editors acquire skills of how to produce critical editions based on common editorial conventions of the organization and physical look of an edition. But the question of why and how to produce an edition in a certain scholarly conventionalized way is seldom asked. The editor is an integrated participant in the circumstantial communication situation scholarly editing and this premise may add to an understanding of how editorial conventions are created and sustained.

References:

Driscoll, M.J. (2010) The Words on the Page: Thoughts on Philology, Old and New, *Creating the Medieval Saga: Versions, variability and Editorial Interpretations of Old Norse Saga Literature*, ed. Judy Quinn & Emily Lethbridge, Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, pp. 87-104.

Hansen, A.M. (2006) Senmiddelalderlige bønnebøger: kulturarv og andagtsbøger, *Studier i Nordisk 2004-2005*, København: Selskab for Nordisk Filologi, pp. 89-102.

Maas, Paul (1958) *Textual Criticism*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Experience and the metaphor of construction

Bettina Perregaard (perreg@hum.ku.dk)

The notion of *construction* is arguably the most widely used metaphor for human cognition and interaction in the 20th century. Developmental psychology, linguistics, and branches of the social sciences have proposed rather different understandings of the working mechanisms of processes of construction for the human mind and the communicative activities of human beings. Often, however, these differences are overlooked and several incommensurable understandings are used interchangeably.

I argue that the widespread lack of reflection on the assumptions and implications of applying the various notions of construction contributes to inconsistencies and contradictions in particular disciplinary contexts. I show how the poststructuralist theory and analytical practices of Discursive Psychology collide as a result of the way *construction* is used in two different understandings: On one hand it refers to discourse as a social construction (in Michel Foucault's sense of the term *discourse* (1969/2002)). On the other it refers to particular participants' ongoing constructions of meaning by means of linguistic building blocks (implying a traditional conception of cognition as involving the manipulation of such building blocks as well as a traditional conception of language as a neutral medium of communication. Ironically, both of these conceptions are explicitly rejected by practitioners of Discursive Psychology (Wiggins & Potter 2007)).

From a phenomenological perspective I also question the adequateness of the metaphor *construction* for the dynamics of ongoing human experience and interaction. What becomes sedimented as norms and conventions for practices of language may be referred to as elements of social construction, but do we really *construct* whenever we speak? In dialogue with Henri Bergson's and Edmund Husserl's respective theories of time, Alfred Schutz (1932/1972) has demonstrated why prephenomenal experience cannot consist in making choices between relevant courses of action or (as I suggest) relevant linguistic building blocks. Adopting the metaphor of social and linguistic construction as illustrative of communicative processes amounts to confusing time with its spatial representation. I conclude by clarifying why construction is a result of the mind's projective and reproductive efforts (planning, reflecting, remembering, deciding), yet cannot be an organizing mechanism of spontaneous (communicative) action.

References:

Foucault, Michel (1969/2002): *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Schutz, Alfred (1932/1972): *The Phenomenology of the Social World*. London: Heinemann Educational books.

Wiggens, Sally & Jonathan Potter (2007): Discursive Psychology. I *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology*. London: Sage, pp. 73-90.

A methodological approach to multimodal communication

Tina Høegh (thoegh@hum.ku.dk)

The paper suggests ways of working with human communication in a holistic framework. To express the meaning of our human speech we use a highly varied spectrum of forms, figures and sounds. The terms forms and figures cover a broad sense of *movements* (Sheets-Johnstone 1999) in time and space, for instance drawings in the air made by gesticulating hands, as well as tropes and figures in the rhetorical sense, (e.g. repetition formed by rhyme), as well as forms and figures materialised in prosody (e.g. tonal variation to emphasize the iconicity of utterances). The question is how to work with a holistic approach of human communication and study the network of vocal variety, voice quality, gestures, and bodily kinetic patterns. Furthermore, a question to examine is *if* we really find patterns or just engaged people with engaging gestures and movements (Trevarthen et al. 2009).

The methods suggested for studying the communicative complex are first of all inspired by folkloristic tradition and ethnography of speaking. But a holistic approach rests on the observer's capability to describe the participant's language rhythm and timing. The *textmaker* (Fine 1994) of a transcription describing individuals' movements in time and space have to invent a transcription policy in *free style,* so to speak, every time he or she begins a transcription. The microanalysis of rhythmic (Cureton 1992), tonal, and spatial movements demands a strict simplification of observations by semiotic transfer to the white page.

The materials presented will be transcriptions of a professional poetry reading (from an audio file) and a teacher explaining a literary text to another teacher speaking a neighbouring language as L1 (video). The Danish poet Inger Christensen (1935-2009) was known for reading her text out loud with chanting, drone out voicing. Is it possible to give a *default* reading (Grønnum 2007) to realize an open text-interpretation, or does chanting work as a specific interpretation, *a message from God*? The teachers have difficulties understanding each other fully and their need to draw figures and concepts in their cospeech gestures (Engberg-Pedersen 2011) is particularly marked. They *build the text* for each other in the space between them.

References:

Cureton, R.D. 1992. *Rhythmic Phrasing in English Verse.* New York: Longman.

Emmorey, K. et al. 2009. Co-speech gesture in bimodal bilinguals. *Language and Cognitive Processes 24* (2) p. 290-312. London: Psychology Press.

Engberg-Pedersen, E. 2011. Cognitive foundations of topic-comment and foreground-background structures: Evidence from sign languages, cospeech gesture and homesign. *Cognitive Linguistics* 22-4, p. 691-718. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Erickson, F. 2009. Musicality in talk and listening: A key element in classroom discourse as an environment for learning. *Communicative Musicality: Exploring the basis of human companionship*. Trevarthen et al. Oxford University Press, 449-63.

Fine, E. C. 1994. *The Folklore Text: From Performance to Print.* Indiana University Press.

Grønnum, N. 2007. *Rødgrød med fløde: en lille bog om dansk fonetik*. København: Akademisk forlag.

Sheets-Johnstone. 1999. *The Primacy of Movement*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Trevarthen, C. et al. 2009. Musicality: Communicating the vitality and interests of life. *Communicative Musicality: Exploring the basis of human companionship*. Trevarthen et al. Oxford University Press, p. 1-11.

"Enough is enough": superdiverse authenticities

Jan Blommaert (jmeblommaert@gmail.com)

Globalization has affected the sociolinguistic landscapes of societies across the world, turning them from relatively stable and recognizable patterns into superdiverse, highly mixed, complex and unpredictable ones. In this apparent sociolinguistic chaos, however, we notice lines and directions that appear to assume degrees of stability. One such line is the line of authenticity: in an age where eclectic mixing and blending has become the rule and an unprecedented amount of freedom exists to create patchworks of micro-identities as part of one life-project, we see the paradoxical appearance of authenticity as a point of orientation. Being 'real' and 'true' to oneself in the myriad roles one assumes and fulfills in society, appears to be a pressing concern for many people. The patterns by means of which people achieve this authenticity, however, are remarkable. Authenticity no longer stands for 'traditional', but for the capacity to blend and mix in specific ways, often creating what could be called 'accents' or 'dialects' of global identity categories - a small inflection of what is otherwise overwhelmingly uniform. This inflection is done by means of small doses of 'authentic stuff'': emblematic features that are adopted from global imagery and blended with local - largely stable and uniform - patterns. The dosing is critical, for 'overdoing' it, or 'not getting there', are both damning identity judgments threatening everyone who strives for such authenticities. Consequently, we see the emergence of the art of mixing, in which judgments of 'enoughness' dominate the game. These processes will be illustrated by means of a range of examples in which 'homeopathic' doses of emblematic authentic stuff are incorporated into local complexes of meaning, indexicality and identity.

Participating in a process of linguistic simplification: Linguistic minority children in a majority classroom

Martha Karrebæk (martha@hum.ku.dk)

Language conventionalization comprises conventionalizing the choice of language. In a primary classroom, learning the norms and conventions of school includes learning which language to speak. In this paper I will discuss how an ethno-linguistically complex classroom manifested itself as monolingual over the course of one school year. I see this as a process of simplification of the linguistic milieu. During my fieldwork I never heard the teachers explicitly instruct the children on which language to use or not to use, and yet Standard Danish came to dominate to the extent that children did not even employ other linguistic resources when teasing and challenging each other, or when engaging in subversive actions and interactions. This observation differs from other studies in similar settings (e.g. Evaldsson & Cekaite 2008; Jørgensen 1998; Slotte-Lüttge 2007).

The issue of simplification can be approached from a variety of angles; ideological, macro-social, teacher-oriented. I will try to bring us closer to the children's own perspectives by offering micro-analysis of interactional sequences where children use features from linguistic repertoires associated with other languages than Danish. In this study I test whether the interactional contingencies of the linguistically complex encounter can help us understand how children themselves participate in the conventionalisation of a monolingual norm (cp. Auer 1998). For instance, to what extent can we locate issues associated with wider social structures, with education ideologies and language ideologies? I will also include statements from the larger data-set concerning language by teachers, children, and parents.

Methodologically the study draws on Linguistic Ethnography (Creese 2008; Rampton 2007). Macro-social issues, such as power, discourses of ethnicity and language are combined with considerations of the socio-cultural context and detailed micro-analysis, inspired by the work of Goffman (e.g., 1974, 1981) and Conversation Analysis.

References:

Auer, P. (ed.) (1998). *Code-switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction, and Identity*. London: Routledge.

Cekaite, A., Evaldsson, A.-C. (2008). Staging Linguistic Identities and Negotiating Monolingual Norms in Multiethnic School Settings. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5 / 3, 177-196.

Creese, A. (2008). Linguistic Ethnography. *In* N. Hornberger (ed.): *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, 2nd edition, 10 / 39.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.
Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Jørgensen, J.N. (1998): Children's Acquisition of Code-Switching for Power

Wielding. In: P. Auer (ed.): *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London/New York: Routledge, 237-258.

Rampton, B. (2007). Neo-Hymesian linguistic ethnography in the UK. *Journal of Sociolinguistics 11* (5): 584-608.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation*. Blackwell.

Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2007). Making use of bilingualism – construction of a monolingualism classroom, and its consequences. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 187/188, 103-128.

My very own personal language?
Dimensions of enregisterment of ways of speaking among the youth in superdiverse urbanity

Jens Normann Jørgensen (normann@hum.ku.dk)

In superdiversity (Vertovec 2006) an increasingly broader range of cultural and other resources are represented in the everyday lives of people, including people who belong to the societal groups with comparatively little access to social and economic capital. The width and depth of resources become immediately observable with respect to language when one enters a typical superdiverse urban environment such as Copenhagen.

In a study of the linguistic everyday of a cohort of adolescent grade school students in a Copenhagen city school (the Amager Project) we have collected a range of material including written self-descriptions in school essays, interviews, recordings of group conversations and other types of interaction.

In this presentation I discuss how the adolescents organize the linguistic resources they encounter or become acquainted with, through contact with peers and other people, and through new social media. Elsewhere (Madsen et al. 2010, Møller & Jørgensen 2011) we have documented how the students have enregistered (Agha 2007) several ways of speaking along a dimension which differs from traditional organization of ways of speaking, at least in Danish society. In addition the students position themselves and each other in relation to a dimension of ways of speaking which more or less coincides with the closeness they assume between themselves and the different ways of speaking. A third dimension is more like a nominal scale, listing all the names of "languages" they know.

I give examples of their statements about the dimensions of languages, and how the young speakers organize their linguistic reality along the dimensions.

Heteroglossia in use

Nina Møller Andersen (ninamoel@hum.ku.dk)

M.M. Bachtin's dialogic discourse concepts have with great results been widely used within discourse theories on spoken language; the problem is that some of these concepts have been misused or used in a way that is far away from the intended understanding, partly because of translations, partly because of Bachtin's own variation in his writings and partly due to a common mingling of concepts within the field. One of the most used dialogic discourse concepts of Bachtin's is heteroglossia. Bachtin did not make up this term himself, it has been 'created' through translation by Michael Holquist from the three Russian Bachtin-concepts rasnoretjije (different speech-ness), rasnogolositsa (different voiced-ness) and rasnojasytjije (different language-ness).

The concept heteroglossia has been used by scholars (e.g. Rampton 2005, Linell 1998, Dysthe 1997/2000) to cover rather different aspects of discourse: polyphony, variation, style etc., concepts that are not entirely corresponding with the bachtinian idea of the three aspects of 'heteroglossia'. Roughly spoken rasnoretjije deals with language on a discoursive level and rasnojasytjije deals with language on a linguistic level, while rasnogolositsa is a vaguer concept, but one might say it deals with language on an interpersonal level. In the paper I will show how the so called heteroglossia has been used in discourse analysis on spoken language, look at Bachtin's intended understanding of the three concepts of the so called heteroglossia, and demonstrate how rasnoretjije, rasnojasytjie (and rasnogolositsa) can be used in an analysis on authentic spoken Danish in time and context.

References:

- Bakhtin, M. M.: *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986
- Bachtin, M. M.: *Ordet i romanen*, Gyldendal 2003 (manus)
- Dysthe, Olga: *Det flerstemmige klasserum. Skrivning og samtale for at lære*. Klim. 1997
- Dysthe, Olga: "Mitt ansvar er å gi elevene de redskaper de trænger for å lykkes" I *Dansk I Dialog*, Dansklærerforeningen 2000
- Linell, Per: *Approaching dialogue. Talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspectives* , John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadephia, 1984/1998
- Møller Andersen, Nina: *I en verden af fremmede ord. Bachtin som sprogbrugsteoretiker*. Akademisk Forlag, 2002.
- Møller Andersen, Nina: "Bachtin og det polyfone" i Sproglig Polyfoni. Tekster om Bachtin og ScaPoLine. (red. Rita Therkelsen, Nina Møller Andersen og Henning Nølke), Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 2007.
- Rampton, Ben: *Crossing. Language & Ethnicity among Adolescents*, St. Jerome Publishing, manchester, UK & Northhampton MA 2005.